DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 150 102 SP 011 771

AUTHOR Reed, Horace B.; Rindone, Douglas
TITLE Graduates' Perceptions of Teacher Preparation Programs, of Demographic Data, and of Inservice Needs, Class of 1975.
INSTITUTION Massachusetts Univ., Amherst. School of Education.
PUB DATE Apr 76
NOTE 27p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Demography; Needs Assessment; Participant Satisfaction; *Preservice Education; Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Student Needs; *Student Opinion
IDENTIFIERS *University of Massachusetts Amherst

ABSTRACT

This fourth annual survey of the School of Education, University of Massachusetts (Amherst), presents graduates' perceptions of their preservice teacher education programs, other demographic and inservice information, and their expressed needs for further study and experience. Questionnaire data results are tabulated for graduates of all of the School's twenty teacher preparation programs. In addition to this total sample, the study presents an analysis of thirteen programs that had six or more graduates responding to the questionnaire. Limitations of the study are noted. Appendices include the questionnaire and tables of pertinent data. (MJB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED150102

GRADUATES' PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAMS, OF DEMOGRAPHIC DATA, AND OF INSERVICE NEEDS, CLASS OF 1975

by

Horace B. Reed

and

Douglas Rindone

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Horace B. Reed

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND THE EPIC SYSTEM CONTRACTORS."

for the

Teacher Education Council

School of Education

University of Massachusetts

April, 1976

SP011 771

Graduates' Perceptions of Teacher Preparation Programs,

of Demographic Data, and of Inservice Needs,

Class of 1975

INTRODUCTION

This is the fourth, successive, yearly survey of teacher preparation graduates conducted by the Teacher Education Council (TEC), School of Education, University of Massachusetts. This year's study also includes information on graduates' employment status, plus several other demographic questions. In previous years a set of questions was included aimed at gaining information on graduates' perceptions of their inservice performance. In this year's survey a new set of items is included, designed to gather information on graduates' expressed needs for further study and experience.

THE QUESTIONNAIRE

A sample of the questionnaire is included in Table A. There are 29 items (#4-32) that explore selected features or components or experiences that relate to preservice teacher education. Then there are 17 items (#33-49) that ask for specific information about the possible usefulness to the graduate of further professional training. Item #50 is an open-ended question asking for additional areas of need. The last set of questions (#51-62) are designed to gather employment and other demographic information. A final open-ended question (#63) provides for any further comments that might be useful to the School in its teacher education efforts.

Refinements in the construction of the questionnaire continue to be informed by contributions from faculty and doctoral students, TEC's research assistant, seminar students in teacher education courses, responses of preservice graduates, and fellow researchers. In addition, a pilot study last spring (1975) of employers of our graduates, resulted in fresh suggestions for item changes and new items. TEC's shift towards more emphasis on inservice teacher education motivated a basic change in one whole set or items. Finally, the past studies have consistently demonstrated that certain preservice experiences are particularly noteworthy, because they sharply distinguished among programs, and/or because for the total sample they were especially high or low in ratings. The most extensive modification has been the expansion of items relating to the field experience (#10-15).

THE SAMPLES

The questionnaire was sent to all graduates on record of the 1975 class who had completed one of the School of Education's 20 teacher preparation programs. Of the 704 TEC mailings sent out, 47 were not deliverable; those contacted were 657. After a second mailing to those who had not responded, the total response sample of those contacted was 223 or 34%.

In addition to the total sample of graduates, the study includes an analysis based on a sample made up of the various teacher education programs. Of the 20 programs in the study, 13 had 6 or more graduates responding and these were used for the analysis of programs.

As a partial check on the representativeness of our responding sample, we made a telephone survey of a random sample of the nonrespondents. Forty-one nonrespondents were reached, which is a 10% sample. We hypothesized that nonrespondents would have a lower rate of full-time teaching than the responding sample. However, the nonrespondents reported that 31.7% had full-time teaching employment, compared with the responding group with 27.4%. This is a significant difference at the .05 level. We also explored 2 other variables. "Overall quality" of their teacher education program resulted in no significant difference in the 2 samples. On the variable of "help and support from the program staff," the nonrespondents had a mean score of 3.29, compared with the respondent mean of 3.72; this difference is significant at the .05 level. It seems probable that there are no major differences between the 2 groups which would seriously alter the broad, general conclusions we can draw from the data of the responding group.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Several cautions should be noted in using the information (and our interpretations) of this study.

There are the limits discussed above regarding the size and representativeness of the total sample and program subsamples.

The data source is graduates' perceptions. While there is strong agreement among our graduates that almost all preservice items significantly differentiate among programs, it is still necessary to caution that self-reports may have unknown built-in biases that tilt data. Other sources of information should be referred to as a way of putting self-report data into

a wider context.

When examining items that differentiate among programs, the reader is reminded that programs may intentionally differ as to how much importance they attribute to various items. Thus a low rating by graduates of a program on a specific item may be expected, and be of little importance so far as that program is concerned.

Many of the items are relatively abstract. They provide a very generalized form of information. In some instances the data may be useful largely as clues to several additional more specific questions that could be investigated.

RESULTS FROM THE TOTAL SAMPLE

The employment and demographic data is summarized in Table A. Items in the questionnaire numbered 2 and 51-62 provided this information. The data is presented in the appropriate spaces of the original questionnaire form.

Women constitute 80% of the sample (item #2). There is no significant difference in the employment status attributable to sex. A comparison among the teacher education programs shows a significant difference in the proportion of women and men, significant at the .02 level (Chi square). Two programs have markedly larger percentages of men: Intep (31%) and Secondary Social Studies (55%). Five programs had markedly larger percentages of women: Human Development (90%), International Education (89%), Reading (100%), Secondary English (100%), and Special Education (100%).

Regarding employment (item #54), 65% of the sample are working in the area of education, including 27% in full-time teaching, 27% in part-time teaching or paraprofessional work, and 10% in other education work. An additional 11% are in further formal study such as graduate school; 26% are employed in another occupational area; and 6% are neither employed nor in formal study. The total is greater than 100% since some respondents were involved in more than one of the above categories.

In the previous 2 studies, the employment rate for those working in education, including teaching and other related areas, was 67% (1973 graduates), and 65% (1974 graduates). Over the 3-year period, this data holds constant.

For those not teaching (item #62), 26% said they decided they did not want to teach at this time (this is 11% of the total sample), and 74%

reported they wanted to teach but could not find a position or could not find one they were willing to accept (this is 22% of the total sample).

Certification status (item #53) was as follows: 69% elementary, 17% secondary, 2% both, 8% specialist area, 7% none. A few responded in both the specialist area and another category.

The college majors represented in the sample included over 15 areas (item #51). Education is the largest (79%), followed by English (5%), Psychology, Sociology and Political Science combined (6%), and the remaining 1% or less. As regards degree status (item #52), 66% have a Bachelor of Arts and 34% a Bachelor of Science degree.

For those teaching (item #55), 78% are working in Massachusetts, while 22% are out-of-state. Respondents indicate that 30% are in a rural school situation, 37% are suburban, and 33% urban (item #56). The salary range (item #58) is as follows: below $4,000 (34%); $4,000-7,500 (34%); $7,500-9,500 (27%); $9,500-10,500 (4%) and over $10,500 (1%).

In searching for a position (item #59), it is evident that some sources were used extensively: University Placement Service, Vacancy Notices, Career News, Friends, Relatives, Media, Personal Mailing. The total percentages are greater than 100% since graduates often used 2 or more resources.

In actually obtaining a position (item #60, but recorded in item #59), 3 sources were especially used: Friends, Media, and Personal Mailing. Under "Other," with 40% so indicating, graduates mentioned such things as interviews, self efforts, and substitute teaching. It is evident that graduates report little direct placement through University connections.

Of those working, 48% indicated they were well satisfied with their employment situation, while 33% were moderately satisfied, and 20% were not satisfied (item #61).

Preservice Variables and Employment Status (Total)

To check on whether the employment status of respondents contributed to variations in how they rated the preservice items, a Chi square study was made, using "teaching" and "not teaching" as two groups, and 3 categories of ratings (poor, fair, good) on each of the 29 preservice items. Only 1 item was significant at the .01 level or better. This was "duration of student teaching" (item #10), with a contingency coefficient of .25. Five other items showed a slight relationship, with levels of significance of .03 to .07,

and contingency coefficients of .17 to .19.

An examination of the differences in percentages in the poor, fair, good categories of item #10 shows the variations are small, with 1% of "teaching" and 6% of "not teaching" in the poor cell; 94% "teaching" and 78% "not teaching" in the good cell. There appears to be little noteworthy variation in graduates' perceptions of their preservice experiences that is related to employment status.

Inservice Needs and Employment Status (Total)

An analysis of variance study was also made with "teaching" and "not teaching" respondent groups for each of the 17 items concerning possible usefulness of further professional training. There were no significant differences at the .05 level or better.

Thus the hypothesis that graduates' perceptions of their preservice experience or their inservice needs might be influenced by their employment status does not seem to be a major factor in this study.

Preservice Variables (Total Sample)

The most general finding for this part of the study is that the mean scores for the total sample on the 29 preservice variables are almost all higher than in previous years. To compare mean scores across 3-years' studies, these categories were used: mean scores from 1.0 to 2.99 indicate poor ratings for an item; 3.0 to 3.49 represents moderate or adequate; and from 3.5 to 5.0 is considered good (score range is 1 to 5). The data for this year's study places only 1 item, "help in learning about the various programs" (item #31), as poor; 16 variables are considered good. Table B compares results of previous years (1973 and 1974) with the 1975 study.

Compared with previous years, for variables that allow comparisons, the trend for the numbers of variables falling in the poor, moderate and good rankings is:

	1973	1974	1975
poor	6	5	1
moderate	8	9	5
good	5	6	14

Especially interesting, given the School of Education's goals, is the increase in mean scores for the variables of "racism" and of "sexism." These have noticeably increased in ratings this year, compared with the data of the

previous 2 years.

Another positive gain is the variable of "quality of cognitive knowledge"; in past studies this has been rated in the poor category, while in this 1975 study it is closer to a good rating.

In all three studies, the "field experience" is perceived consistently high as regards the local schools' contributions, and moderate in rating as regards "UMass supervision."

The item concerning graduates' overall assessment of their total teacher preparation program shows a rise from 1973 to 1975.

Through a previous study of employers' judgments of our graduates, we found an interest by employers for preservice preparation to include attention to "use of community resources," and to "diagnosing special learning situations." We added items related to these competencies in this study. The results indicate that we currently do less well in both of these (mean scores of 3.1-3.25) compared with many other variables.

Graduates' perceptions of their "foundation's experiences," including both quality and meaningful relationships to the other components of their preparation, continues to be lower than most other preservice learning experiences (mean of 3.0-3.27).

Another way to examine the preservice items is presented in Table C. This lists the 29 preservice variables with the percentage of responses that fall in the poor category (scales 1 and 2) and in the good category (scales 4 and 5). There are 8 variables with 70% or more responding in the good category.

None of the variables had such high percentages in the poor category. There were 5 variables that had responses as high as 30 to 40% in the poor category, all the other 22 variables were lower than that, with 8 having less than 10% responding in the poor category.

Graduates' Needs for Further Study

This study provides considerable information on the degree of usefulness graduates sense as regards further professional training in a number of areas (see Table A, questionnaire items 33-49).

Three areas were apparent as highest need: "diagnosing each learner's characteristics"; "diagnosing special learning situations"; and "interest in innovative teaching and organizing" (mean scores of 3.6-3.8).

Of noticeably lesser need were: "knowledge in interpersonal";

"knowledge about self"; "institutional racism"; "institutional sexism"; and "study of psychology" (mean scores of 2.90-2.99). Even lower in expressed need was the area of "foundations," with a mean score of 2.1.

In the open-ended question asking for additional areas of need, only a few responses were made, with 7 graduates wanting work in methods; 7 mentioning diagnosis of learning disabilities (an area that had been included in the close-ended items); 3 indicating an interest in nonformal education; and a few other areas with only 1 or 2 responses.

Preservice Variables "Not in Program" Response (Total Sample)

Each of the preservice items had a place for the graduate to indicate that their program did not include that variable. The variable with the largest percentage saying "not in program" is understandably one referring to the Potpourri Methods (20%). Next largest was "exploring role of schooling to social change" (9%). Three other variables had 7-8% responses: "other methods," "educational psychology," and "institutional racism."

Quality of Program and Preservice Variables (Total Sample)

In an effort to explore probable relationships of preservice variables to graduates' overall assessment of their teacher preparation program, a Chi square analysis was made. Using "quality of program" (item #30) as the criterion, each of the other 28 preservice variables was seen as an independent variable. For this analysis, scale scores of 1 to 5 for each of the variables and the criterion were collapsed into 3 categories: 1 and 2 = poor; 3 = fair; 4 and 5 = good; this provides 9 cells.

One would expect that ratings for the separate preservice variables of a total program would relate positively to ratings of that total. Such is the case in this study (see Table D). Two items are not significantly related; they refer to areas one would expect to be unrelated: "help from University in learning about various programs," and "quality of undergraduate work other than the teacher preparation program."

While all the other 26 variables are significantly related to graduates' overall program assessment (all have Chi square levels of significance of .02 to .0006), a few are quite strongly related, using contingency coefficients as rough indicators. The highest coefficient is with the variable "meaningful interconnections of learning experiences." Also relatively high were: "agreement with program beliefs"; "methods courses"; "quality of relevant academic

learning"; and "diagnosing learner's characteristics."

Relatively low coefficients were found for: "educational psychology"; "foundations"; "length of time for student teaching"; and "help from cooperating teacher."

Job Satisfaction and Preservice Variables (Total Sample)

Using only the responses from the sample of "those teaching," a criterion measure called "degree of satisfaction with employment position" (item #61) was analyzed in relation to each of the 29 preservice variables. Analysis of variance was used, with groups formed on the basis of collapsed scores on the scales of the items. This was an exploratory analysis; we had only vague notions that there might be preservice variables that would distinguish among low, moderate and high "job satisfaction" groups.

There are 5 preservice variables that did distinguish, with F ratios significant at between .05 to .004. These variables were: "quantity of UMass supervision"; "quality of UMass supervision"; "personal decision making"; "institutional racism"; and "help in learning about programs." We see no apparent logic that helps explain the relationships of these particular preservice variables to the criterion of job satisfaction. It seems doubtful that this approach is useful for either research or implementation purposes.

Written Comments (Total Sample)

There were a number of written comments in response to the open-ended question at the end of the questionnaire, where there was an opportunity for graduates to indicate ideas that might be useful to our programs.

The two areas with the largest number of comments referred to more learning experiences in "methods and curriculum," and more "classroom teaching experience" (about 35 respondents for each of these concerns). More "classroom supervision" (20), and more "educators with teaching experience" (9), were also mentioned. About 5 respondents were tallied for: "better screening for selection" (too many teachers); explanation of "difficulties of the profession" (job market, etc.); more "accessible staff"; more "help obtaining jobs"; more emphasis on "nonformal and education-related fields." In addition, 7 respondents recommended less learning experiences in "foundations."

RESULTS OF PROGRAM ANALYSIS

Comparison of Programs on Preservice Variables

Of the 20 preservice programs in the sample, 13 had 6 or more graduates responding, and these were used for the program comparison analysis. The purpose of this analysis is to test whether there are significant differences among the 13 program mean scores, on each of the 29 preservice variables. We were also interested in identifying for each program the actual graduates' ratings for each variable.

Using analysis of variance, there are 21 preservice variables where the mean scores are significantly different (from .05 to .0000 levels), and 8 variables that are not significantly different (Table E). Among these 8 variables, where the mean scores are statistically similar among the programs, 2 refer to "foundations of education"; 2 refer to the "local school field experience"; and 1 to "help from University in selecting program." All these are variables that are less likely to be influenced by differences in planned program content and implementation; thus one might expect fewer differences in the mean scores of these variables. The other 3 items with no differences were "decision making," "academic knowledge," and "self-knowledge."

To provide a rough estimate of the overall comparison among programs, we selected a 0.6 spread around the midpoint of the mean score for each variable of the total for the 13 programs. Thus for variable #4 "methods potpourri," that total mean score is 3.44 and the 0.6 spread includes mean scores of 3.14 to 3.74. Any program with a mean score for that variable that was higher than 3.74 was given a high (H) rating; any with a mean score less than 3.14 receives a low (L) rating. In Table E, under each variable listed, there is a column "A" that records the H's and L's for each program. Programs with mean scores within the 0.6 range are left blank, meaning they are considered relatively similar to the mean for the total program sample.

In a second analysis using Chi square, percentages of responses were determined in the low to middle (very poor, poor, and fair), and in the high (good and excellent) part of score range for each of the 29 preservice variables for each program. In this analysis, tabulations were made of instances for each program where 50% or more graduates rated a variable low, and where 50% or more rated a variable high. This provides information about each program, for each variable, that is independent of other programs. In

Table E there is a column "B" for each preservice variable, with tallies for the programs with graduates' responses of 50% or more in the high range of each variable score (H), and with responses of 50% or more in the low range of each variable score (L).

Summary Comparison of Programs on Preservice Variables

In Table E there is a summary tally for both the analysis of variance and Chi square studies for the 13 programs on the 29 preservice variables. There are 7 programs that stand out in their high ratings: Alternative Schools, Explorations, Intep, Mark's Meadow, Special Education, Urban Education, and Human Development (see below). The first 6 are perceived by their graduates as stronger than the other programs on 10 to 19 preservice variables; they are seen as good to excellent by 50% or more of their graduates on 22 to 28 of the variables. Further, these 6 programs all have quite small numbers of variables with low ratings. Only on 1 to 4 variables are they perceived as poorer than the other programs. And on only 1 to 7 variables do 50% or more of their graduates rate them as low (very poor to fair).

One program, Human Development, is clearly also in this high ranking group. In the Chi square study, they are seen as good to excellent on 27 of the 29 variables. In the analysis of variance study, their "n" of 59 is considerably higher than the other programs. This makes it much less likely that they would have very many variables in either the high or low category in comparison to the other programs. Even so, the program has 7 variables in the high category.

Five programs are perceived by their graduates as relatively low on a large number of the preservice variables: International Education, Off-Campus, Reading, Secondary English, and Secondary Social Studies. For these programs there were 17 to 22 variables in the analysis of variance study that their graduates saw as lower than the other programs. And on 14 to 18 variables these 5 programs were seen as low (very poor to fair) by 50% or more of their graduates.

Comparison of Programs on Future Needs Variables

There are no significant differences among the 13 programs on the mean scores for the 17 variables that sought information on graduates needs for further professional training. We do have detailed information concerning the percentage of responses for each program, grouped into low, moderate and

high need categories. This data will not be reported here. Staffs of individual programs might want to examine this data since it provides leads for possible future inservice work with graduates.

Employment Data for Programs

The employment status by programs is presented in Table F. There are 3 programs with markedly higher full-time employment rates, compared with the overall rate: Reading, Special Education, and Urban Education. Combining all employments in the field of education (both teaching and other education work) shows considerable variations among programs. Alternative Schools and Secondary Social Studies are quite low with 34%, while Explorations and Special Education have a high of 83%.

There is other demographic information available for each program. Much of this is not useful for some of the programs, due to the small number of respondents for some of the questionnaire items; we will not attempt to report this data here.

Table A Questionnaire for UMass Graduates of Teacher Preparation Programs With Demographic Data (Total Sample)

1. Name _____ (All responses are confidential; names are requested in the event a second mailing is necessary to obtain maximum returns.)

2. Sex (Circle the appropriate number.) (1) female 80% (2) male 20%

3. Circle the teacher preparation program you were enrolled in:

(1) Alternative Schools (2) Amherst-Pelham Elementary (3) Bilingual/Bicultural (4) Cooperative Education (5) Environmental Education (6) Explorations (7) Global and Future Studies (8) Human Development (9) International Education (10) INTEP or METEP (11) Mark's Meadow (12) Media Specialists (13) Off-Campus (14) Reading Specialist (15) Secondary Ed. English (16) Secondary Ed. Science (17) Secondary Ed. Math (18) Secondary Ed. Social Studies (19) Special Education (20) Urban Education (CUETEP) (21) Other

Please rate, for questions 4-32, your experiences in your teacher preparation program: (Place a check next to the appropriate number.)

4. Usefulness of methods modules (Potpourri).

1 _____ very poor 2 _____ poor 3 _____ fair 4 _____ good 5 _____ excellent 6 _____ not part of program 7 _____ if none, check if needed

5. Usefulness of other methods courses.

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____ 6 _____ 7 _____

6. Quality of your educational psychology (or similar) course/training.

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____ 6 _____ 7 _____

7. Meaningful relationship of your education psychology (or similar) course/training to the rest of your preparation program.

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____ 6 _____ 7 _____

8. Quality of your foundations of education course/training.

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____ 6 _____ 7 _____

9. Meaningful relationship of your foundations (philosophical or sociological or historical) of education course/training to the rest of your preparation program.

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____ 6 _____ 7 _____

10. Provisions for the length of time (hours, days, weeks) available to you for student teaching.

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____ 6 _____ 7 _____
very poor | poor | fair | good | excellent | not part of program | if none, check if needed

11. Useful characteristics of the local school classroom to help provide learning for you during student teaching.

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____ 6 _____ 7 _____

12. Useful characteristics of the total local school situation to help provide learning for you, during student teaching.

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____ 6 _____ 7 _____

13. Quality of explicit, useful help and criticism by the local cooperating teacher.

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____ 6 _____ 7 _____

14. Provisions for the quantity of supervision by UMass staff, during student teaching.

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____ 6 _____ 7 _____

15. Quality of supervision by UMass staff, during student teaching.

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____ 6 _____ 7 _____

16. Training in your program in the use of community resources for learning experiences (such as museums, field trips, places of business, human service organizations).

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____ 6 _____ 7 _____

17. Training in diagnosing each learner's characteristics (attitudes, abilities, past experiences, goals) and incorporating into teaching and learning.

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____ 6 _____ 7 _____

18. Training in diagnosing special learning disabilities and incorporating into teaching and learning.

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____ 6 _____ 7 _____

19. Help in understanding and constructively using in teaching and learning, information about each learner's social, economic, ethnic, and cultural background.

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____ 6 _____ 7 _____

20. Opportunities for your decision-making in setting personal goals and choosing your own methods for reaching goals.

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____ 6 _____ 7 _____

21. Quality of useful knowledge in relevant academic disciplines (subject matter facts and theories) provided in your program.

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____ 6 _____ 7 _____

22. Quality of useful knowledge about interpersonal interactions (between teachers and learners; among learners; among staff).

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____ 6 _____ 7 _____
very poor poor fair good excellent not part of program if none, check if needed

23. Quality of useful knowledge about your self (your attitudes, abilities, interests, goals, self-evaluation, self-concept).

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____ 6 _____ 7 _____

24. Efforts by your program to explore the relevance of institutional racism to teaching and learning.

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____ 6 _____ 7 _____

25. Efforts to explore the relevance of institutional sexism to teaching and learning.

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____ 6 _____ 7 _____

26. Efforts to explore the role of schooling in the study of social, economic, political change in the culture.

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____ 6 _____ 7 _____

27. Degree of support, personal help, useful advise you had from the staff of your program.

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____ 6 _____ 7 _____

28. Your agreement with the educational beliefs that were encouraged by your preparation program.

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____ 6 _____ 7 _____

29. Meaningful interconnections among the various courses and components of your overall teacher preparation program.

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____ 6 _____ 7 _____

30. The overall quality of your teacher preparation program.

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____ 6 _____ 7 _____

31. Help from the University and School of Education in learning about the various teacher preparation programs.

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____ 6 _____ 7 _____

32. The quality and relevance of your undergraduate work (general education, academic minor or major), other than your teacher preparation program, to contribute to your teaching.

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____ 6 _____ 7 _____

Please rate for questions 33-50, the probable degree of usefulness to you to have further professional training (such as inservice programs, graduate work, workshops) in the following: (Place a check next to the appropriate number.)

33. Lesson/curriculum planning

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____
almost none a little some much very much

34. Classroom management

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____

35. Evaluation of student learnings

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____

36. Knowledge in relevant academic disciplines

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____

37. Knowledge in interpersonal interactions

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____

38. Knowledge about yourself (self-evaluation; self-awareness)

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____

39. Relevance of institutional racism to schooling

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____

40. Relevance of institutional sexism to schooling

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____

41. Use of community resources for teaching and learning

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____

42. Study of psychology applied to education

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____

43. Study of the philosophical or sociological or historical foundations of education

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____

44. Ways to diagnose each learner's characteristics and incorporate into teaching and learning

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____

45. Ways to diagnose special learning disabilities and incorporate into teaching and learning

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____

46. Ways to understand and constructively use information about each learner's social, economic, ethnic, and cultural background

1 _____ almost none 2 _____ a little 3 _____ some 4 _____ much 5 _____ very much

47. Ways to increase opportunities for learners to have decision-making powers to set their own goals and choose the methods to reach those goals

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____

48. Interest in learning about innovative approaches to teaching and organizing the school

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____

49. Opportunities for study or work in education in differing settings (another school; another subculture; in a nonschool situation; another culture)

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____

50. Please mention additional areas you would find most useful for further training/experience:

_____

Please provide the following information:

51. Your college major Education 79%; English 5%; Social Sciences 6%; Other 10% 52. Your degree BA 66%; BS 34%

53. Certification status: 1 65% elementary; 2 17% secondary (name the field) _____; 3 2% both; 4 4% specialist (name area) _____; 5 7% none.

54. Employment status (check the appropriate items): In percentages
1 27.4 full-time school teaching; 2 27.2 part-time school teaching or paraprofessional work; 3 10.3 working in an education field, but not directly teaching; 4 10.5 further formal study; 5 26.3 employed in another occupation area; 6 6.3 not employed nor in formal study.

55. If teaching:
1 78% In-State; 2 22% Out-of-State (where?) _____
Name of immediate employer (such as school principal): _____
Full School Address: _____

56. 1 30% Rural; 2 37% Suburban; 3 33% Urban

57. Approximate number of students in total town or city school system 1 _____
2 No information _____ (Did not tabulate).

58. Salary range: 1 34% Below 4000; 2 34% 4000-7500; 3 27% 7500-9500;
4 4% 9500-10,500; 5 1% 10,500-12,000; 6 ____ over 12,000 (amount _____)

59. In your search for a position, check any of these that you used:

			Data for Item #60, "Position Actually Obtained"
1 38%	University Credential Service	1 1%	
2 26%	Vacancy notices, Career Library, SDC	2 ____	
3 17%	Campus Recruiting Program (Interviews)	3 ____	
4 28%	Career News	4 ____	
5 19%	Departmental faculty/resources	5 3%	
6 61%	Friends/contacts	6 21%	
7 14%	Commercial Employment Agency	7 2%	
8 28%	Relatives	8 1%	
9 48%	Newspaper Ads/Professional Journals	9 13%	
10 43%	Personal Mailing Campaign	10 19%	
11 15%	Other. Describe _____	11 40%	

60. Position was actually obtained by/through see item #59, column on right side.

61. Degree of satisfaction with your position: (circle number)

1 very low (20%) 2 low 3 moderate (33%) 4 high (48%) 5 very high

62. For those not teaching, please check the most appropriate response:

1 26% I decided I don't want to teach at this time.

2 74% I want to teach, but could not find a position, or could not find one I was willing to accept (explain briefly): _____

_____

OPEN ENDED QUESTION

63. Please include any comments here that you feel might be useful to programs preparing teachers:

Table B Relative Mean Scores of Preservice Variables (Total Sample)

#		1973	1974	1975
4	Methods (Potpourri)	3.06	3.10	3.47
5	Methods (Other)			3.72
6	Quality Educational Psychology	3.27	3.35	3.69
7	Meaningfulness Educ. Psychology			3.44
8	Quality Foundations	2.87	2.95	3.27
9	Meaningfulness Foundations			3.01
10	Duration of Field Work	NA	NA	4.45
11	Usefulness of Local School Classroom	NA	NA	4.29
12	Usefulness of Total Local School	4.34	4.43	4.24
13	Quality of Cooperating Teacher Help	4.06	4.16	4.06
14	Quantity of UMass Supervision	3.15	3.21	3.07
15	Quality of UMass Supervision			3.23
16	Community Resources	NA	NA	3.25
17	Learner Diagnoses	3.49	3.65	3.64
18	Special Learning Diagnoses	NA	NA	3.10
19	Understanding Varied Learner Background	2.93	3.10	3.51
20	Personal Decision Making	3.57	3.63	4.05
21	Quality of Academic Learning	2.59	2.79	3.51
22	Quality of Interpersonal Learning	3.57	3.64	3.75
23	Quality of Learning of Self	3.24	3.38	3.53
24	Institutional Racism	2.76	2.84	3.42
25	Institutional Sexism	2.44	2.75	3.42
26	School and Social Change	2.97	3.06	3.34
27	Advising Help Program Staff	3.00	3.32	3.72
28	Beliefs of Program Goals	3.16	3.38	3.88
29	Overall Interconnectedness	NA	NA	3.48
30	Overall Quality of Program	3.40	3.48	3.65
31	Help Learning About Programs	NA	2.43	2.73
32	Overall Quality of Undergraduate Experience	3.85	3.86	3.94

Table C Percentage of Responses in Poor and Good Categories (Total Sample)*

#		% of Responses Poor	% of Responses Good
4	Methods (Potpourri)	16	53
5	Methods (Other)	9	63
6	Quality Educational Psychology	14	65
7	Meaningfulness Educ. Psychology	20	57
8	Quality Foundations	28	48
9	Meaningfulness Foundations	35	35
10	Duration of Field Work	2	90
11	Usefulness of Local School Classroom	5	86
12	Usefulness of Total Local School	6	83
13	Quality of Cooperating Teacher Help	12	74
14	Quantity of UMass Supervision	35	41
15	Quality of UMass Supervision	29	49
16	Community Resources	30	45
17	Learner Diagnoses	14	62
18	Special Learning Diagnoses	32	42
19	Understanding Varied Learner Background	21	56
20	Personal Decision Making	9	75
21	Quality of Academic Learning	15	55
22	Quality of Interpersonal Learning	11	65
23	Quality of Learning of Self	8	75
24	Institutional Racism	19	50
25	Institutional Sexism	19	51
26	School and Social Change	19	48
27	Advising Help Program Staff	18	63
28	Beliefs of Program Goals	9	73
29	Overall Interconnectedness	16	56
30	Overall Quality of Program	11	62
31	Help Learning About Programs	42	28
32	Overall Quality of Undergraduate Experience	7	71

* The difference between 100% and the combined percentages of the Poor and Good categories is the percentage of responses in the Fair category.

Table D Preservice Variables Related to Quality of Program (Total Sample)

#		Chi Square Level of Significance	Contingency Coefficient
4	Methods (Potpourri)	.0000	.47
5	Methods (Other)	.0000	.53
6	Quality Educational Psychology	.02	.24
7	Meaningfulness Educ. Psychology	.01	.25
8	Quality Foundations	.001	.29
9	Meaningfulness Foundations	.0000	.38
10	Duration of Field Work	.001	.29
11	Usefulness of Local School Classroom	.0000	.40
12	Usefulness of Total Local School	.0000	.36
13	Quality of Cooperating Teacher Help	.002	.28
14	Quantity of UMass Supervision	.0006	.30
15	Quality of UMass Supervision	.0000	.37
16	Community Resources	.0000	.35
17	Learner Diagnoses	.0000	.51
18	Special Learning Diagnoses	.0000	.35
19	Understanding Varied Learner Background	.0000	.37
20	Personal Decision Making	.0000	.47
21	Quality of Academic Learning	.0000	.53
22	Quality of Interpersonal Learning	.0000	.60
23	Quality of Learning of Self	.0000	.45
24	Institutional Racism	.0000	.43
25	Institutional Sexism	.0000	.42
26	School and Social Change	.0000	.42
27	Advising Help Program Staff	.0000	.45
28	Beliefs of Program Goals	.0000	.54
29	Overall Interconnectedness	.0000	.64
31	Help Learning About Programs	.26	.16
32	Overall Quality of Undergraduate Experience	.99	.03

Table E Comparison of Programs on Preservice Variables

PROGRAMS**	Preservice Variables N	#4 Methods Potpourri A*	B	#5 Methods Other A	B	#6 Quality Ed. Psychology A	B	#7 Meaning Ed. Psychology A	B	#8 Quality Foundations A	B	#9 Meaning Fourdations A	B	#10 Field Work Duration A	B	#11 Quality Local Classroom A	B	#12 Quality Local School A	B	#13 Quality Cooperating Teach. A	B	#14 Quantity UMass Super. A	B	#15 Quality UMass Super. A	B	#16 Community Resources A	B	#17 Learner Diagnoses A	B	#18 Special Learn. Diagnoses A	B	#19 Varied Learner Background A	B	#20 Decision Making A	B
Alternative Schools	6		H		H		H		H	H	H	H	H		H	L	H		H	L	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	L	H	L	L		H	H	H
Amherst Elementary	22		H		H	H	H	H	H		H		L	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	L	L		H	L	L		H		L	L	L		H
Explorations	12	H	H		H	L	L	L	L	H	H	H	H		H		H		H		H	L	L	L	L	H	H		H		L		H	H	H
Human Development	59	H	H		H		H		H		H		L		H		H		H		H	H	H		H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H		H
International	9	L	L		L	L	L	L	L	L	L		L		H	L	L	L	H	L	H		L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	H	H		L
Intep	13	H	H		H	L	H	L	L		H	H	L	H	H	H	H		H		H	L	L	H	H		L	H	H		H		H		H
Mark's Meadow	13	H	H	H	H		H	H	H	H	L	H	L	H	H	H	H	H	H		H	H	H	H	H	H	H		H	H	H	H	H		H
Off-Campus	23	L	L	L	L		H		H	L	L	L	L		H	L	H	L	H		H	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	H
Reading	10	L	L	L	L		H		H	L	L	L	L		H		H		H		H		L	L	L	L	L	L	H		L	L	L	L	H
Secondary English	10	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	H	H	H	H	H		H		L	L	L		L	L	H	L	L		L		H
Secondary Social Studies	11	L	L	L	L		H	L	L		L	L	L		H		H		H		H		L		L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L		H
Special Education	12	L	L	H	H	H	H	H	H		L		L		H		H		H		H	H	H	H	H	L	L	H	H	H	H	H	H		H
Urban Education	6	H	H		H		H		H		H	H	L		H		H		H		H		L		H	H	H		H		H	H	H		H
Significance Level for Column "A"			.000		.005		.003		.000						.004		.000						.001		.005		.000		.000		.000		.005			

* Column "A" has high (H) and low (L) ratings, comparing each program mean score on each variable with the total mean; blanks are where program and total means are relatively similar. Column "B" tallies 50% or more of program respondents falling in low (L) end of item scale or in high (H) end of scale.

** Programs with six or more graduates responding.

Table E (continued)

Preservice Variables	#21 Academic Knowledge		#22 Interpersonal Knowledge		#23 Self-Knowledge		#24 Institutional Racism		#25 Institutional Sexism		#26 Social Change		#27 Advising Help		#28 Belief in Goals		#29 Overall Meaning		#30 Quality of Program		#31 Learning About Programs		#32 Quality Undergraduate		Totals of Column A		Totals of Column B	
PROGRAMS	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	High	Low	High	Low
Alternative Schools	H	H		H	H	H		H		H	H	H	H	H	H	H		H	H	H	H	H		H	13	4	28	1
Amherst Elementary		H		H		H		L	L	L	L	L	L	L		H		H		H		L		H	6	6	19	10
Explorations		H		H		H	H	H		H	H	H	H	H	H	H		L	H	H	H	H	H	H	12	4	23	6
Human Development		H		H		H		H	H	H		H		H		H		H		H		L		H	7	0	27	2
International	L	L	L	L		H		H		H	H	H	L	H	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L		H	2	18	11	18
Intep		H		H		H		L	H	H		H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H		L		H	11	3	23	6
Mark's Meadow	H	H	H	H		H		H		H	H	H	H	H		H	H	H	H	H		L	L	L	19	1	25	4
Off-Campus	L	L	L	L	L	H	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L		H	L	L	L	H	H	L	H	H	2	22	11	18
Reading	L	L	L	L	L	H		H		H	L	L	L	L	L	H		H	L	H		L		H	0	17	15	14
Secondary English		H		H	L	L	L	L		L	L	L		H	L	H		H	L	L	L	L		H	2	17	12	17
Secondary Social Studies		H		H	L	H	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	H	L	L	L	L		L	L	H	0	17	11	18
Special Education	H	H	H	H		H		H		L		L	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H		L		H	14	2	22	7
Urban Education	H	H		H		H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H		L		H		L	L	L	10	1	24	5
Significance Level for Column "A"			.002			.002		.017		.032		.000		.013		.000		.000				.034						

Table F Employment Data for Programs in Percentages

	Full Time	Part Time	Indirect	Total Educ. Work	Not Employed
Alternative Schools	0	17	17	34	33
Amherst Education	18	37	9	64	14
Explorations	25	50	8	83	0
Human Development	29	28	16	73	5
International Educ.	22	44	11	77	0
Intep	31	15	31	77	8
Mark's Meadow	31	46	0	77	0
Off-Campus	22	30	9	61	9
Reading	40	20	0	60	0
English	20	30	0	50	0
Social Studies	27	0	9	34	0
Special Education	50	25	8	83	0
Urban Education	67	0	0	67	0